Boston University

College of Liberal Arts
Library

The Problem of Social Inequality

A Thesis.

by

A. Cameron

PH. D. 1891.

NOT TO BE TAKEN
FROM THE LIBRARY

Class. distinction

PhD
1891
c

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2013

http://archive.org/details/problemofsociali00came

The Problem of Social Inequality.

This problem has come to the front, and in some of its phases it haunts all Christendom. It may be accepted as a good omen that it belongs especially to Christian lands. In countries where the leaven of Christianity has not been introduced, no social questions disturb the hopeless condition of the masses. Arrested and dying civilizations give no voice to the under strata of society. Outside of Christian influence there never was any great party to espouse the cause of the poor. We need not look upon the current agitation as an evil. It may indicate growth and progress. Revolutions may not be pleasant, but they may be necessary to introduce higher civilizations. On the other hand mere discontent, if uninformed and unguided, bodes disaster. The social

unrest, so widely prevalent today, is not primarily a political disturbance, as it was in France a century ago. The first French Revolutionists declared that 'landed and other property was thenceforth sacred'. The political power of the old rulers was to be destroyed, as indeed it deserved to be. The poor were to be protected, but it was not thus intended to make them rich. In some countries today, as in Russia, the immediate dream of the agitators may be larger political liberty; yet where this is the avowed aim, it is but a means to an end, and generally the social agitator has no interest in politics save as a means to further his social plans. This grows out of the fact that the social inequalities which he would abolish have survived all political revolutions. We may note, however, that the general trend is toward Democracy as more likely

to favor the socialists' purposes.

What is it, then, that the agitators want? In some places, political equality, civil justice, a fair opportunity for the kingdom of heaven - all meagerly enough doled out; but in every place the demand is for more leisure, more material comforts - the kingdom of this world.

These demands do not arise from the fact of inequality simply, but because there is a conviction that the inequality is needless and unjust. It is the inequality of the distribution of wealth that forms the basis of comparison and complaint, though this is not the only inequality, nor yet the most fundamental. There are inequalities of inherited mental and physical conditions that have more to do with life than has the size of ones bank account. Yet it must be confessed that financial conditions largely determine the opportu-

miliūs, and even the possibilitiēs of life, and that "the destruction of the poor is their poverty". At any rate, the financial inequality is the only one legislation could seem to affect. No one thinks of demanding a law requiring all to be mentally or physically equal; the effort to make all financially equal may turn out to be a like impossibility.

A full discussion of all that is involved in this problem would take us through the entire range of political and social science; but we shall consider only some of the factors involved, and we shall do this under three general topics: I The Causes of the Social Unrest.

II The Schemes Proposed for Relief.

III The Reforms at Present Possible.

Chap. I Causes of the Social Unrest.

The one all-including cause is, of course, the inequality itself, and the conviction that it is needless. But the special clamor of today has special causes for its existence, and some of these we shall point out.

We have already said that a measure of discontent is a normal condition of growth. There is a legitimate demand for something better which makes the better possible. It would be an unspeakable disaster if entire contentment or despair, should come to the masses when in mean conditions. But this normal restlessness may assume a form that destructive of the social life. We think the present restlessness is extreme. The difficulties confronting us are in some respects modern, and belong to the present century, and in a special sense to the present generation. Other features of the case are as old as civilization. When Nabal refused the request of David

for a contribution, he declared that "there be many servants nowadays that break away every man from his master", which was probably a trite remark. David's request was based upon his need and upon service rendered, if not acknowledged. The demands which dissatisfied labor makes to day are substantially the same in pretention, and refusal is quite as apt to stir up wrath now as then, because of the real or supposed injustice of the refusal.

We have no wish to overlook the real need of very many; yet it is doubtless true that the present clamor does not arise so much from those in actual want as from those fairly comfortable who are envious of the larger possessions of the rich. The false teaching given out by many leaders has led a large class to believe that they have been wronged. It is accepted as an axiom by labor agitators that "labor is the creator of all wealth" and since the

laborer does not have the wealth, the inference is that he has been defrauded. This supposed axiom underlies the whole of modern discontent. The argument is, "All wealth is due to labor, therefore to labor all wealth is due". If we were to understand by labor any mental or physical effort by which results are achieved, even then the argument would not be entirely true. But this is not the implied definition of labor. The usual conception is that of muscular effort including only so much mental labor as is expended by the same man who does the manual labor. The foresight, insight and oversight of the employer is not reckoned as labor at all. And yet these are the most important factors in the production of wealth, as any man can discover for himself by making a tunnel in the wrong place through a mountain. The disciples were not alone in the experience of toiling all night & taking nothing, because fishing

in the wrong place. Mere labor creates no wealth. It must be directed and related to wise ends before it has value. Capital is quite as essential to production now as labor, & capital is not "stored up labor" - least of all, the stored up labor of the present malcontents, who have received more for their labor than they could possibly have received had there been no capital to help them. A source of fallacy here is the habit of estimating every thing from the standpoint of the original savage. If superior skill had not devised tools, (capital) supplementing labor, we had been in original savagery to this day. But suppose the original savage for the privilege of using a superior weapon which he himself could not make & by the use of which he could kill four times as much game as before, gave one half of the larger spoil to the man who gave him the weapon, would the poor savage be robbed? Certainly not. Carry this idea forward into all the complex relations of our modern life and

one needs only a little calm reflection to see how much labor owes to the man who plans, invents, organizes and manages the vast system of production & distribution which makes life today possible. The present population of the world could not live at all if there was nothing but labor, as commonly defined, to support it.

The agitator may admit that labor does not produce all the wealth, and then he modifies his claim somewhat, & his new contension is that labor does not receive its just share of the product. He will allow capital some what, but would put the capitalist on shorter rations. He would see the inequalities now existing much lessened. We may, perhaps, join him in this, but this phase of the discussion will come up later on. We now turn to the claim set up by Mr. Mallock in his "Social Equality" where he claims that social inequality can never be overcome without a return to savagery. Mr. Mallock contends that when once the

differences of condition have ceased, there would be nothing to arouse and direct energy, and men would be satisfied with less and less until the barest necessities of savage life would be the only objects of pursuit. His idea is that the masses must be compelled to work by making the conditions of existence hard - by withholding enough of the product of labor to induce continued effort. Hence he looks upon the demands of Democracy as a menace to civilization, and pretends to have given the first scientific refutation of these demands. *

To which we reply (1) That Democracy has triumphed in America, with none of the evils we fears.

(2) That if civilization must exist for a few special classes it is no brilliant success. It is time we undertake to show that civilization

* Note. I have summarized these from the general tenor of his book, (Specially Chap. I & Chap. VI.) Social Equality. by W. H. Mallock, London. 1882.

makes better the condition of all classes, which is not in serious dispute; but the argument seems rather to be made to quiet the fears of the upper classes. No one doubts that there is great need of right for guidance, care and government; but if the upper classes suppose that civilization exists especially for them, I think there is already incipient savagery, and it is among these same upper classes. There was doubtless a time when slavery was essential to progress, when the best thing to be done under the circumstances was to enslave the barbarian and make him work. Aristotle supposed slavery was the final condition of the working classes. But the time came when slavery stood across the path of progress, and had to be abolished, as a condition of economic as well as of moral growth. The trouble with Mr. Mallock is that he takes certain past or present conditions as the only possible ones for all time.

He says, (P. 135) "All productive labor that rises above the lowest is always noticed by the desire for social inequality." In developing this, his fundamental proposition, he tries to show that wealth is produced only when necessity is laid upon the laborer - the necessity originally for bread, and that there is no real desire among laborers for wealth today, and if not compelled by those socially above them, they would only work today sufficiently to produce their own bread. This supposition is not creditable to the civilization of which the workers form so large a part. If the proposition were true, the pathway to higher civilizations leads to the absolute suppression of the rising democracy, and to exacting the full tale of brick, making the laborer find his own straw. We should also look for the best civilization in Ireland, Russia & Italy where labor is paid most poorly. But the fact is, where labor is best paid, as in America and England, the labor is most efficient and

civilization is the highest. Granting this fact, there is no reason why the laborer should not be motived more and more by a desire for his own wealth, even though he did not see occasionally the wealth of his master. The Irish peasant may insist upon having his pig in the kitchen. (Social Equality, p. 166). but labor in this country is quite in advance of that social standard. And the more widely and evenly the products of labor & capital can be justly distributed and wisely employed, the higher is the civilization and the greater the possibilities of its growth. And Mr. Mallock's scientific refutation of the aims of Democracy shows rather that they need be preached, in Ireland at least, until children & pigs are reared in separate enclosures.

But while we reject Mr. Mallock's refutation we by no means claim that the demands of labor are always wise or just.

It is agreed on all sides that the world is richer to day than ever before. The marvelous growth of splendid cities, the multiplied power invention gives, the activities of Commerce, the reclaiming of continents from barbarism all show that wealth has increased prodigiously, and, as statistics show, it has increased faster than has the population. But here we are met with the assertion that this wealth is not so evenly distributed as in former years. The current maxim is, that "the rich are growing richer and the poor are growing poorer every day." A few extraordinary examples and an ordinary imagination enable the agitator to show to the amazement and rage of his listeners that in a few years more a few men will own all the land and controll all the capital of the country. The laborer then, it is assumed, will be starved outright just as fast as it may please the greed of the monopolists to order the process.

But what are the facts? Is it true that the rich are growing richer and the poor poorer? There may be frequent examples of both sides of the proposition, but it is not true as a generalization. The utmost that could be claimed is that the rich are growing richer more rapidly than the poor, which would call up the question as to fact, and as to the utility of the fact, if granted. But even this important modification of the maxim does not accord with facts.

How is the laborer growing poorer? Wages have increased, and the purchasing power of his wages is greater. That is, the laborer does not have to work so long for a dollar and his dollar will buy more comforts than formerly. All commodities are cheaper with the exception of perishable farm products - which the laborer was formerly not able to buy at all. Rent has increased, but his house is much better than before. We do not need to go back to the time when the laborer's hut had neither furniture, windows nor chimneys in making this comparison. Fifty, or even thirty years will be sufficient to show the advance in material comfort enjoyed by laborers today.

The average mechanic of today, if he be temperate and has not been the victim of special misfortune, has advantages and comforts which the rich might have envied a few generations ago. He can have books, carpets, instruments of music, opportunities for travel, etc, which not long ago were the exclusive possessions of the rich. Add to this the advantages of schools enjoyed by his children, and the various public institutions open to him at little or no cost to himself, and no one not utterly oblivious to the facts can accept the popular maxim. "The improvement in the condition of labor is patent to any of the older men of today. Shorter time, better pay, cheaper living all make higher social conditions possible.

Apart from common observation we sustain these declarations by reference to statistics given by Robt. Giffen in "The Progress of the working Classes" pp 5. 7. 13, 17, & 20.

That there has been a decrease of the number of paupers notwithstanding the increase in total population in the last thirty years, see same book p. 23.

He also shows on the same page that the statistics

of savings banks show an increase of tenfold in the number of depositors and of five fold in the amount of deposits. Mr. Giffen shows also (p. 34) "that almost the whole of the great material improvement of the last fifty years has gone to the masses." He gives tables on pp. 34 and 35 from which he concludes as follows: "From this it appears that the increase of what is known as working class income in the aggregate is greater than that of any other class, being 160 per cent.; while the return to capital and the return to what are called the capitalist classes, whether it is from capital proper or, as I maintain, a return only in the nature of wages, has only increased about 100 per cent.; although capital itself has increased over 150 per cent. At the same time the capitalist classes themselves have greatly increased in number, so that the amount of capital possessed among them per head has only increased 15 per cent., notwithstanding the great increase in capital itself, and the average income per head can have hardly increased at all. On the other hand, as the masses of the nation, taking

the United kingdom altogether, have only increased about 30 per cent. since 1843, when these income tax figures begin, while their aggregate incomes have increased 160 per cent., it is explained how these incomes have gained, individually, about 100 per cent. as against hardly any increase at all in the income of what are called the capitalist classes, on the average. Thus the rich have become more numerous, but not richer individually; the 'poor' are, to some smaller extent, fewer; and those who remain 'poor' are, individually, twice as well off on the average as they were fifty years ago. The 'poor' have thus had almost all the benefit of the great material advance of the last fifty years". Progress of the Working Classes. p. 36.

These statistics & conclusions are for the United kingdom. It deserves to be remarked that Mr. Gunton shows that

the increase of wealth per capita is greater in England than in the United States, and contends that the improvement of the condition of the working classes in England is more marked than it is with us. (See pp 350-352 of Wealth and Progress by Geo. Gunton. Third edition. D. Appleton & Co. New York 1890). While we may therefore accept Mr. Giffens' conclusion with some modifications in the U.S. they nevertheless indicate the general trend here as well as in England.

These facts are not sufficiently attended to even when we may assume that they are known. The temptation to demagogues and stumpspeakers to appeal to the discontent which a little careless rhetoric will inflame is perennial. Hence political capital is made of existing evils, and times of peace and plenty are promised as a result of the passage of special measures.

When the prophecies fail there is always the opposite party to be saddled with the blame for the failure, and driven as a convenient scape goat into the wilderness.

3. As another cause of the discontent, we name the general mammonism of the age. The age is sadly given to the love of money. There is a disposition to wink at almost any fault if the erring one have money, or the power to controll it. The other side of this disposition is the little regard for man as man. True, in a goodly number of such souls, "A man's a man for a 'that'"; but the dullest can see the potency of a well-filled purse, and the multitude joins vociferously in the worship of Mammon.

But as the multitude is poor, the worship takes the form of envy, rage and discontent. The undue influence of money is seen even in our Courts of law, where, though the presiding goddess is portrayed as blind, she nevertheless has keen

vision for gold. It is notoriously difficult to bring a rich rascal to justice, while the poor Italians can expect the full rigor of the law. If we confessed the whole truth we should say that our great criminal & corporation lawyers are too often great because they have defeated justice. Our law processes are too tedious and expensive. Juries are so often either stupid or venal that there is but little confidence in their verdicts. Were we to grant that much of the scepticism respecting the integrity of verdicts was unfounded, yet the fact that such scepticism prevails has a disastrous force little short of that which venality itself would have. Nor is this belief that money improperly affects results confined to the interpretation of law. There is a widespread conviction that money influences legislation also, and that the measures backed by

the most money are the ones adopted. The feeling that laws are made and interpreted to specially favor the rich gives intensity to the desire to have more money. We pass no judgment here upon the truth of these beliefs. It is enough to point out that they exist.

4 The under power of mere wealth is also shown in the so-called "society" life. There is a welcome shown to the rich even in the Church which the poor man does not receive, or thinks he does not. True, a poor man endowed with exceptional genius may enter the exclusive society of the rich, at least to be "lionized". Thus Robert Burns was received by the aristocracy of Edinburgh and "dinnered wi' a lord," at which dinner Robert Colliyer says that same lord is indebted for his escape from entire oblivion. Great service or

prowess has been an open avenue to social recognition from the days of Joseph in Egypt till now, when the explorer of Africa, Stanley, though brought up in a poor house, is admitted to any social circle. We are not complaining that "society" maintains a certain exclusiveness, nor would we defend the man who is envious of any "400" in the land.

But we do say that the worthy Joseph in the house of Potiphar is not fairly treated, and when he comes to distinction it is not because he is found to be innocent and worthy, but because he has power to shape events to the satisfaction of the rich; and thus the mammon spirit underlies the recognition that is at last shown him. The aristocracy of mere wealth is the shoddiest aristocracy extant, and yet there is a tendency, inveterate and perhaps increasing, to measure all success by financial standards. All

this tends to make the poor man despise his lot and despise himself. Surely those at least who follow the Carpenter of Nazareth should be quick to honor character wherever it is worthy - and to honor nothing else.

This worship of mammon is indicated by the want of personal sympathy between the employer & his men. It is difficult to describe this condition accurately, and it will be more difficult to enforce a remedy. The only bond between the the laborer & his employer is too often only a financial one. Once the workman enjoyed a certain relation to his master that was not cancelled by any stipulated wage. He was in some respects a part of his master's household and shared his life in many ways. But now the employer does not know anything about his men, and perhaps cares less, if the service rendered is passable. This makes possible

a remark I have seen quoted in some newspaper, said to have been made by a New York railroad official, who, when it was suggested that the Company ought to put up a shed to shelter their men from the rain, replied, "men are cheaper than shingles." Contrast this indifference to the comfort of employees with the spirit shown by Perry Mason & Co, Publishers of the Youths Companion in giving, last year each clerk in their employ a fifty dollar note as a Christmas gift, and it will not be hard to tell where dissatisfaction and strikes will be found. Until religion, humanity and sound political economy shall teach all employers that a man is better than a sheep, better than a machine, we shall always be on the verge of explosions. I am able from personal acquaintance with facts, to say that all rail road officials do not share the spirit indicated by the remark reported above. The Penna.

R.R. Co. where they have any considerable number of men in a place, have provided fine waiting and reading rooms for their use, which they keep stocked with papers and magazines, and employ men to look after the moral and spiritual interest of their employes, and this not because it is cheaper than police duty, but because they have a genuine interest in their men. This work which is under the R.R. Branch of the Y. M. C.A. shows what is being done, but it is yet so exceptional.

5 But mammonism, while it leads to undue class distinctions & hence dissatisfaction, is but a symptom of the general materialistic conception of life which obtains among rich and poor alike. There has been an alienation of the thinking wageworkers from the Church which upon the whole is increasing. (See Prof. Ely's Social Aspects of Christianity, Chap V. New York. Thos. Crowell & Son 1889)

The reasons assigned by Prof. Ely are want of love for the poor on the part of the rich; failure to understand and espouse the cause of the wage earners even when clearly just; disposition to give the rich special honor and privilege in the Church; failure to rebuke the sins of the rich with the same directness and zeal as that directed against poor sinners, and a tendency to run the Church as interested specially in other world concerns while ignoring the kingdom of heaven here.

I venture to epitomize this as but showing a lack of appreciation for man as man. In the matter of Sabbath reform e.g. the primary idea usually is not the needs of man, but as the "sanctity of the day" which is extolled. It would be possible to enlist working men more widely in Sabbath reform if it were shown that "man was not made for the Sabbath but the Sabbath for man"; that is, that

The Church really cared more to restrain the greed that would drive men 7 days in the week than to preserve a "sacred institution". We venture also the idea that the Church has been in a manner compelled to deal as she has done, by her very necessities. These necessities arise out of unchristian sectarianism and the rivalries this induces. In how many thousand villages all over the land is the Church absolutely struggling in poverty to maintain three or four different Protestant Churches, when one would amply supply all spiritual needs! Is it the spirit of Christ that perpetuates this? None but the blindest bigot could answer, yea. The result is the Church has felt her dependence upon the richer members, and it has unconsciously modified her utterances & learned her power. Then how many costly edifices does every city contain where the poor are really not wanted at the morning services?

Let Christ come along some day in his peasant garb, and note the look on the face of the usher!

Of course these rich Churches care for the souls of the poor, and they build Chapels in which the poor can be taught the way to heaven. It will be time enough when heaven is reached to have actual fellowship with the masses! In the mean time the poor condemn with awful emphasis the whole Church & the one place she would escape. The Church must get nearer to Christ & pulsate more with his warm sympathy toward the poor, if she would meet the responsibility upon her.

If now the Church has lost her influence upon the masses, if a belief in a world to come has been diluted by scepticism & "magazine science", what wonder there should be a loud demand for this world at least?.

6. We name one more condition

that has caused the disturbance of today and
makes it more of a menace, viz., the in-
troduction of the "factory age." A very
few generations ago the laborer owned
his own tools and was to some extent
the master of his own time. Now he
is part of a complex mechanism and
must move with it or retire. If he
loses his place he finds it more diffi-
cult to obtain another. It is true that
machinery has superceded much hand
labor and thrown many out of work.
But it has also made much more
work by making a richer life possible.
We should not forget, when hearing
the prejudice against machinery either
its maledictions, that machinery has ben-
efited labor more than it has capital;
that it would not be possible to feed and
clothe the present population of the
world without the help of machinery.
The hope of the future lies in good part

in the increased efficiency & perfection of machinery. We should remember also that Capital has suffered in the transition, and will suffer yet more. How many costly machines not nearly worn out have been sold to the junk shop because some thing better has come into competition? How many glass and nail factories are idle and valueless in New England today because of the discovery of natural gas? A good many. Yet we acknowledge that labor has not the resources to avert distress that are open to Capital in these Changes. It remains however as a fact in proof of the importance of machinery to labor, that wherever machinery is employed most extensively there labor is best paid. and it matters but little which fact is the cause of the other. And yet the introduction of machinery and the massing of

capital which it required, has changed the status of labor and has often brought a pressure upon individual workmen. The single handed laborer was no match for the new conditions. Therefore he entered into trades Unions and bound himself to obey orders - not always wisely given. This federation of labor gives it power for good or evil. Capital has also entered into combinations, and syndicates, rings & trusts are the result.

And the present relation between Labor and Capital is that of an armed expectancy, each side ready to break into open hostilities at the first promise of victory.

Whether we have explained the causes which have led to the unrest and clamor there is no doubt that there is a condition today that is full of menace. In the midst of plenty there is squalor as abject and pitiable as any to be found in London. Mr Riis has shown that we have in New York

multitudes of cases that appeal to every sentiment of humanity. It is said that in New York one tenth of all who died in 1889 were buried in the Potters Field. In 1890 over twenty three thousand families were evicted for non payment of rent in New York.*

Many of the sufferers are children who have no responsibility for their condition. They are growing up in a squalor that is the more dangerous because associated with every vice. It is not clear that society as such is not more responsible than is commonly acknowledged. At all events these children are a part of our social life and will fill jails & penitentiaries in due course. They can at least prove their claim to consideration by breeding pestilence.

Carlyle tells of a poor Irish widow who appealed in vain for help and finally died of typhus fever brought on by want, causing the death of 17 others. (See Past and Present p. 149. Harper Bros. N.Y.)

*Editorial note in Arena Feb. 1891.

And here in our Metropolis where want
is most extreme "society" perpetrates
its extravagancies and iniquities. We have
no titled class the patent of whose nobility
provides neither character nor brains;
but we have inequalities quite as
marked as Monarchies can show.
Wealth may once have been a mark of
merit and character, but now it is
too often the indication of greed, hardness
or dishonesty. Is our civilization which
seems to doom so many to unmitigated
and hopeless penury, while others speedily
amass millions, the consummation of
injustice and unwisdom? Is it to give
way to something better, & how?

Wise and humane men ask these
questions. In the Babel that answers
one can hear all sorts of answers. But
no thoughtful man can remain a mere
spectator. But after a survey of the
world's misery it is well to remember

once more that it has improved and is improving. We are in danger of too hasty conclusions when we let feeling have play. If we blame civilization for the misery extant, we must credit it for a vast deal of comfort.

Poverty in its abject form is not so general as many suppose. A moderate amount of poverty enforces needful discipline. In this country at last most of the successful business men, statesmen & scholars come from the poorer classes.

Then, too, there are those who estimate character justly. It is only in the froth and vacuity of a "society" which no sane man could envy that a boor is welcomed because he is rich.

After all we grade ourselves in the real society, and a boor must remain among the boors till he reforms his manners. It is possible to lift up the lower, and for its own sake if for no other, civilization must abolish the ignorance, disease and vice which underlie most distressing

poverty.

Chap II Schemes Proposed for Relief.

1 Admitting that there are inequalities which are needless and dangerous, we come now to consider the remedies proposed. There are many, and each particular plan has its enthusiastic adherents. As a panacea for economic ills in our own land some would increase the protective tariff, while others are sure the way to prosperity is to remove the tariff altogether; some contend for bimetalism as a specific, while others cling to the gold standard as the one anchor of hope. We can not enter upon any particular examination of these points. Only we are persuaded that the benefits of the protective tariff have gone largely to the manufacturer. The workman had to sell simply his labor, and the manufacturer could bring into competition the labor of Europe. True there is a law

against importing laborers under contract, but it easy to violate its spirit by scattering enticing circulars in the labor markets of Europe. New arrivals of immigrants are often glad to accept work at almost any price. Many of these immigrants are from countries where the standard of living for their class is much lower than here. They often keep to their old standard, and thus do not become consumers to any great extent of ~~this~~ product of other men's labor. Add to this that that many of them return after a few years carrying with them their earnings. These cheap foreigners often become the most turbulent of strikers, after a few years, inflicting cost upon the community in the shape of law suits, etc. It is to be regretted that our tariff and immigration laws are so mixed up with party politics and class interests that it is difficult to arrive at any unity of sentiment and action in the

matters involved. But if we are to have a protective tariff that will benefit the masses we must restrict immigration. There are grave reasons why immigration should be looked into apart from industrial considerations. Yet we think it is clear that a high tariff on every thing but labor tends to enhance the value of every thing but labor, and temporarily enhances the wages of labor too, until immigration makes an unnatural competition. The facilities for the interchange of knowledge, and of products and of peoples are now so great that no Chinese wall can be thrown around any one nation. Civilized nations must stand or fall together in economic prosperity. No one nation could adopt the eight hour day of labor so zealously advocated by Mr. Gunton, and permanently hold its own against another nation of equal resources which maintained

the ten hour standard. We may conclude this passing reference to tariff and immigration laws by saying that these are only temporary expedients at best, and cannot be put forward as final solutions of our economic questions, and it is only on political occasions that they come forward as boasted solutions at all.

2 Among the least radical of the remedies proposed for the relief of poverty is Coöperation. This appears to the uninitiated as a great scheme for saving the profits of capitalists, managers & middlemen and the entire class usually condemned as parasites living on the toil of others. It has promised large results but has made but meager returns.

In ideal Coöperation there is no working for wages, but for a proper share of the net profits. It would seem to follow

that industry care and economy would here have their greatest stimulus. But all these concerns that are properly industrial fail for want of efficient management. It is the old story of too many cooks spoiling the broth. There may be a hundred good workmen in a company, and not one of them be capable of managing the concern successfully; and if there should be, the chances are that the ninety nine would not let him. The endless interferences on the part of the interested ones bring the company to grief. and when it comes to sharing losses, there is dissatisfaction. Besides, most workmen prefer a definite sum even if it be a trifle less.

In Cooperative distribution, as in the store business where the stockholders themselves furnish most of the customers there is more chance of success, and in England there has been some real success in this line. But there is sharp

competion in this line, and foresight, skill and experience are needful here as in other enterprises, and these qualities cost money to command them. We believe that the distribution once so generally undertaken by the Grange movement has been abandoned as on the whole not securing any real advantage.

3 A modification of coöperation which promises more success is that of profit sharing. In this the employes have nothing to do with the management, but they share, in addition to their wages, a part of the profits. The great store of Mr. Wanamaker in Phila. is conducted on this plan. But very few stores in the long run have profits to divide. Mr. Wanamaker has exceptional business ability. To make the principle general would require reduction in the stipulated wages, else the present wages are not as high as they might be. We are

however inclined to look upon profit sharing as the best mode of stimulating interest and economy yet devised. It will give a community of interest at least, and we see no valid grounds against extending it. The sliding scale of wages under which iron workers work, is but a modification of the profit sharing idea. It is to be remembered however that coöperation, if it be a benefit, is limited to those in it, and their concerns become fierce rivals against each other, and can not be regarded as final unless the whole nation is in the organization.

4. Nationalization of Land is a more revolutionary scheme for abolishing poverty. Henry George is the recognized apostle of this idea in America, while Father Mc. Glynn is one of the most notable disciples. Mr. George details his plans and convictions in his "Progress & Poverty" with entire assur-

ance that to abolish private property in land is the one way to the economic millennium. One can but admire the zeal and rhetorical ability with which he advocates his cause: but not so much can be said for his wisdom and logic. Many of his fundamental "facts have not gone through the process of having occurred." He has exhausted the capacity of language in describing the ills of our modern life, and lays the entire blame on private ownership in land. This is the real dragon which is playing havoc with humanity, and Mr. George would rival the old St. George by slaying it. His theory of wages is stated thus: "Wages depend upon the margin of production, or upon the produce which labor can obtain at the highest point of natural productiveness open to it without the payment of rent." (Progress & Poverty. popular Edition p. 136)

Mr. George looks upon private ownership in land as robbing capital as well as labor. Three points are fairly deduced from his premisses:

(1) Where land is free wages will be highest.

(2) Where rent is highest wages will be lowest. and profits & capital lowest.

Where land is freest, i.e. rent lowest, wages are <u>lowest</u>. This is so plainly a matter of common notoriety that one cannot see why Mr. George ventured to assert the contrary. True if the land were absolutely free, and one cultivated it he would have the entire product which we may in a loose sense call his wages. But he would not necessarily have more or even as much as another worker might have who worked for another i.e. paid rent. Rent is always highest in large cities and close to them & here wages are <u>highest</u>, in direct refutation of Mr. George's theory of wages.

We have absolutely nothing to prove

The economic wisdom of Mr. Georgi's plans except his statements which are entirely regardless of facts. But to the discontented dweller in the crowded city where his views are mostly preached, nothing looks more desirable than the privilege of going into the suburbs and taking up a piece of land upon which to make a living. Mr. George does not propose that the State shall steal the land outright, but gently saddle all tax upon it - up to its full rental value if need be. Thus all industry is to be relieved and a corner lot vacant will pay the same tax as one beside it with a four story piano factory employing a Thousand men. A town of vacant lots is in no pressing need of police regulations, school expenses etc, because there are no people upon it. A tax is not designed as a fine levied upon industry or improvement, but as improvements are increased the necessity

for public revenue increase, and the taxes must be levied, and in the long run it does not matter whether the tax is levied on the land or on its improvement. It is to be remembered that there could be no tax whatever collected from unimproved or unused land, in Mr. George's scheme. If no one should want the land for any particular year the tax would cease. The "unearned increment" of which he makes so much would apply to buildings as well as to land itself. Mr. George has or will suppose leased from the state a lot suitably located for business & built thereon a store room or a hotel. In a city of 10.000 people his store or hotel is worth so much say 1.000 dollars per year. The city increases to 100.000 persons & his store is now worth 10.000 dollars per year. He has himself done nothing to increase its value. The public Mr. George contends, should have the

the additional 9,000 dollars & would take it, not as upon the increased value of the house, or sight or number of stories added to the house, but because it rested upon a specified portion of land. But suppose the city instead of growing from 10000 to 100000 population declines to one thousand and his house is now of rental value of only 100 $ per year - Suppose it is empty altogether and no one wants it. If there is unearned increment there is also unexpected and unmerited loss. Will the state make this up? Mr. George can go into towns over which "Ichabod" is written, & buy houses for less than the cost of the material & get the land thrown in. It would seem that if the state has so clear a right to unearned increment it should also share the losses also. And then industry & the "wild catting" natures would be encouraged, with a vengeance. If we suppose the

State to take up all lands either by force, theft, purchase or taxation to full rental value, we shall be interested to know how the main business — agriculture, will flourish. The State will have to rent the land to the highest bidder. If the lease be granted for a short term, say five years, there will be no inducement to the occupant to put up buildings, plant orchards or make other improvements of a permanent nature, as he could not take these things with him and the State could hardly be expected to pay for all these, & the next tenant might not care to have them. The temptation to "skin" the land would be very great. Buildings, fences etc. would be neglected and the land would be impoverished. But if the leases were given for an indefinite time so as to encourage good husbandry, then all the evils of private ownership would ensue.

Of course - without fair purchase of the land

there would be monstrous robbery of the present owners. One man has expended ten thousand dollars for a lot - another has heard it and expended ten thousand dollars on a building put upon it. What right has the state to tax the first man entirely out of his income & let the second man off scott free? There would seem to be no justice in such arrangements and we see no policy in it either. We may remark that the high seas are owned by the world in common and men who fish or sail thereon do not have to pay any original squatter any rent for the privilege of fishing. Yet we are informed that the irregularities of sea going men are quite as marked as among land dwellers. (Note. See Mr. Georgis theory ably discussed by Mr. George Gunton, "Wealth & Progress" pp. 60-70. Also a discussion by Toynbee in "Industrial Revolution" pp 142-3. Mr. Toynbee, while

rejecting Mr. George's theory thinks, however, that he has made out a "strong case against private ownership in land in great towns." Great towns sometimes spring up rather unexpectedly, and are hardly ever built first on paper. The "Fabian Essays in Socialism" p. 160, shows that Mr. George's scheme taken alone, i.e. without complete socialism, is inadequate & pernicious).

5. The Malthusian remedy is more pernicious than any yet considered. Malthus in 1798 published his "Essay on Population". His central proposition is that "population tends to increase faster than the means of subsistence", and hence it somewhat inevitably follows that if checks were not placed upon this tendency to the increase of population the world would soon come to the starving point. Hence such things as war, pestilence, famine and disease carrying off infants were blessings

very thinly disguised. These were "positive checks". We believe no one looks with any favor upon these today. Whatever danger there may be ultimately of a population's becoming too dense for subsistence, it is yet remote as far as Christian lands are concerned. The population in India is on the verge of starvation, but they have not the improved methods of cultivation & distribution, and so India is therefore not a case in point. Over population can not therefore be considered a cause of any of the actual want today. There is a theory of wages called the "wages-fund" theory which supposes there is a certain amount of capital set a part as wages. And hence if the number of workers be doubled each one will on the average get only half as much. Even on the basis of this theory there is no reason why the wage fund should not increase fast or even faster than the workers naturally increase. The fund has of course increased since Noah came out of the Ark. But we

which this theory. Workers are not paid as a rule out of a fund, but out of the products which they help to produce. The more workers the more wealth, up to the limit of subsistence. It has yet to be proved that there is even any such limit. Who knows what new improvements are possible in agriculture, what new grains may not be produced? Enough poi can be grown on a square rod to sustain a man a year. May Chemistry not yet turn inorganic matter into food direct, without the agency of vegetable Transmutation? We refuse to be a cast-ist yet at all events. We have large faith in man's power to subdue the earth.

But what is called neo-Malthusianism has its adherents, theoretically and practically. This advises "preventive checks" to population viz. celibacy, late marriages, and limiting number of offspring in wedlock by continence or artificial contrivances. This subject is more properly associated with ethics & hygiene than with political economy. It has

however an important indirect bearing upon our subject. We remember to have read somewhere in the writings of the late Dr. Whedon and of Henry Ward Beecher that refinement & culture were preventive checks by eliminating sexual desire. We believe Herbert Spencer has advanced the idea that nervous development operates in the same way. Hence the natural check to excessive population is the increased culture & refinement of a higher civilization. If there were any truth in this notion it could only be because higher civilization destroyed health; and then we should have the alternation of a race of weaklings or a return to a more barbarous state. We reject all such theories as utterly false. If persons in the upper classes do not have as large families as their more uncultivated neighbors it is because they have adopted preventive checks, and these are almost never along

the line of continuance. It must be evident to any observer that preventive checks are being used, and an increasing number of women look upon child bearing as a nuisance and calamity, if not a vulgarity. The consequence is that the population is being recruited most rapidly by the understrata. The family whose means, intelligence and social condition would make a large family economically desirable will have none at all, or only one or two children, and these will be spoiled and grow up to be nuisances. Seymour (in Industrial Revolution, p 107) quotes Mr. Amasa Walker as saying that "in Mass. there are about 980000 persons of native birth as against 260.000 immigrants and the number of births in each class is almost exactly the same". That is, the foreign woman raising here bears nearly four times as many children as does the native woman. Any one who believes that the tendency to seek divorce, or to evade

marriage altogether, or to shirk, after wedlock, family responsibilities betokens confirmance in, to say the least, remarkably guileless. In general marriage, and early marriage at that, is the surest safeguard against lewdness. And if economists, moralists and social leaders shall ever conclude that marriage without children is the ideal thing, it will not be long before the masses will omit the formal ceremony of marriage as too restricting and complicated an arrangement. The result will be, in such a case, moral chaos which will make the speedy destruction of the degenerate race "a consummation devoutly to be wished".

We conclude with a remark made by Prof. Townsend to his class in 1890 that "a family without children indicates either disease or vice"

(Note. We have not intended this reference to be at all complete, and only generalize. There are of course

many cases where celibacy or late marriage may be consistent with highest virtue, as when one is obliged to care for dependents, or is fired by some high ambition to gain an education, or some low ambition to win a fortune. There are cases too, when persons may marry and get children be undesirable because of hereditary taints likely to be entailed. Ordinarily however we should counsel such persons not to marry at all. The romantic love which makes the marriage seem desirable would have a happier career if it be kept an ideal romance, which is not likely among wedded invalids. When ovariotomy as a therapeutic necessity has been performed before marriage, we suppose the woo would be frankly told of the fact, and if he still insist on marriage, which we would judge in such a case, be almost invariably unhappy, he must abide his lot. We record here our conviction as a result of consider

able opportunity for information, that the responsibility and blame, if it be a fault, for the decline of the birth rate among women of the upper & middle classes rests oftener with the wife than with the husband.

There is an impression abroad, and it is doubtless warranted, that American girls have not the health to become mothers without special pain and danger. Of this there are two things to be said. First, that much of the physical and nervous injury is the direct result of the dislike to maternity, which amounts often to continual protest during the whole time of gestation. No one would desire to see ~~excessive~~ Child-bearing imposed upon any woman. A period of two or three years at least ought to intervene between the ages of the children. Second, that if American girls are not equal to a natural physiological function which under proper care ought not to be destructive of health or longevity,

there here is a serious and important field for the reformers who are so anxious to "emancipate" the gentler sex. Perhaps it is time women took seriously to qualifying themselves to do well what they only can do, and cease to clamor for duties which they "can do just as well as a man can".)
(See "Plain Words on the Woman Question" by Grant Allen in Fortnightly Review, for Oct. 1889)

6 Socialism

But all the remedies hitherto considered are looked upon as but provisional by those who believe the real economic paradise can be found only in Socialism. When we ask what socialism is, what it proposes to do and when and how, we hear at once many discordant voices. The imperfect general understanding of its essence, aims and methods is due largely to the unclear utterances of socialists themselves

The confused popular conception is also due in part to a misunderstanding of its plans & spirit on the part of its opponents. There are some so-called socialists who are anarchistic & destructive, the whole force of whose utterances is expended in denouncing the present system. They are willing to trust to fortune for the upbuilding of something better on the ruins of the old social fabric. The popular conception in the minds of those who oppose Socialism seems to be that Socialism is merely a periodic distribution, equally or otherwise, of all wealth. Even in the minds of recognized socialistic leaders there is a fundamental disagreement as to the mode of distribution of wealth to be adopted. Sometimes we hear of "to each according to his need"; but this being manifestly a very difficult thing to determine, the more recent writers would have all share

alike. This is the mode illustrated by Mr. Edward Bellamy in "Looking Backward", who evidently means to be taken seriously, and whose book is looked upon as a gospel of the new social dispensation. Others reject this equal division, and advocate distribution to every man according to his work." We hope this matter may be fairly adjusted before we come to the new Canaan, as it bears a very important relation to industrial production and prosperity. The utility and glory of socialism in production usurp the chief place in the minds of its advocates.

The essential idea of socialism is that the State, i.e. society as a whole, should own and controll all means of production and distribution of wealth, whether land shops, tools, ships railroads, or whatever enters into the production of wealth. These means are now owned by private parties who enter into competition with

each other to supply the world's needs. in the hope of course of supporting themselves in the process. Socialism would change all this, stop all competition and have all Capital united & directed by the one vast corporation called the State. Each worker would be in the direct employ of the State. A Central bureau would determine what to produce & how to do it, guided of course by public demand. The Postal & military departments of the government are used & illustrate the idea and show its feasibility. Rents, interest, mortgages and all evidences of debt between individuals, and even gold as a measure of value would be done away. It must be observed that both the praises and the censures which this revolutionary scheme receives must be based upon merit and viciousness now hypothetical. There is as yet no such institution

as that contemplated, for all the little socialisms such as the "Shakers" and the "Economites" that have had financial success, had surrounding them the ordinary world from which to choose & to which to return its members, & products.

Both parties appeal to the Postal service - the one to show its wisdom & utility - the other points out that the postal service is not a financial success, that a deficit has to be annually provided for, and that as a business institution it would not long be solvent. It is shown too that when the Service loses your letter you have no redress, as there seems to be no way of fixing responsibility that is entirely efficient. It is further pointed out that the Postal service is mostly clerical and routine work vastly different from the complex nature of most industrial enterprises. To all which we reply that most industries are capable of systematic

arrangement of details, &c. becoming routine.
and that if the Postal Service were carried
on by a dozzen or more rival companies
it would itself be rather complex.
Again, it deserves to be remembered
that the Post Office is in, to itself, disas-
trous competition with private companies
in the most bulky and expensive part
of its work - the carrying of packages.
Invariably the express Companies would
get the profitable part of this trade.
One wants to send a parcel from Boston
to Brockton the postage on which would be 30
cents. it will be sent by express. But the
same 30 cts will carry it by mail to
San Francisco, while the express charges to that
place would be a dollar or more.
The Government could doubtless do the
express business Cheaper in connection
with its postal service, and some way of
guaranteeing parcels against loss could
be adopted. We regret that nothing very per-

ment either for or against socialism is to be proved by the Postal Service.
Manifestly, however it is of importance that military movements made in harmony with our central plan and authority. Any want of such harmony could but result in disaster.

It is claimed by Socialists that industrial movements are onslaughts upon want, and want of unity in management leads to disaster. To this want of unity "gluts" in the market, leading to strikes, etc. are refered. It is pointed out, too, as bearing in favor of Socialism that small concerns cannot successfully compete with large ones in the same field. This tendency of large concerns to supercede smaller rivals is held up as at once an indication of the drift toward the Socialistic idea of production and a proof of its economic success.

Again, it is pointed out that state or municipal controll and supervision are now exercised in a variety of ways. The

citizen is directed as to the kind of house he shall build because of public interest in sanitation fires, etc. Corporations are directed as to modes of braking cars, constructing bridges etc. The state directs concerning the education and employment of children under a certain age. These interferences with individual liberty are wise and needful. That they will ultimately lead to actual Socialism is very doubtful.

It is evident that Socialism, if it is to be the ultimate goal of civilization, must be introduced by degrees, and the agitators, few in number, who would precipitate so revolutionary a change suddenly & violently are without influence. When once the altruistic spirit which would make Socialism possible as a working mode of industrial life is reached then it will matter but little what form the social organization takes. That is to

say, Socialists in describing their Utopias do not consider man as he now is; but they picture him as wise, patient, industrious, benevolent, — altogether a regenerate being. This entire change in human nature is assumed as a direct result of the abolition of poverty. In the "cloud palace picture" of Mr. Bellamy it is taken for granted that the vast amount of selfishness, greed and sin now extant will depart forthwith when plenty smiles upon all. In fact Socialistic writers generally, Mr. George as well as the more radical, refer nearly all sin and crime to poverty, as though poverty were the necessary antecedent to depravity and competition for bread the only devil. We grant the great temptations to which poverty exposes us, — the strain on moral fiber is often intense because of it. But a man is not a villain simply because he must wear a mean coat and often

go hungry. Men who have never known poverty, and who have no reason to fear it, have their great temptations too, which they do not resist with any more success than do the poor. This is not a question of abstract speculation. We speak not of poverty occasioned by personal vice, as much of the extreme poverty is, when we say that God's choice of "the poor of this world to be rich in faith" has been rewarded by a very general response, and the men who have had virtue, heroic patience and enthusiasm and hope in lifting up the world, achieving great things for their own and future times, were as a rule men who had sharp discipline in poverty; while the waxing fat of prosperity has led to moral obtuseness & obduracy in countless instances.

No! the easy and certain filling of the stomach is not the solution of

of the creation of sin; and in lands where food is naturally most easily obtainable all that is most valuable in human character is most rare. The possibility of regaining man's lost virtue involved the discipline of hard conditions; hence it was not rage but love that turned him out of Eden and doomed him to struggle against thorns and briars. We insist that the changes in human character necessary to make Socialism possible are so great that when once the changes have taken place, it will not matter greatly what special form the civilization may assume. Will it ever be possible to supplant envy, selfishness and greed by the altruistic spirit? Believing in Christianity and in man, we answer, yes. But it will not be done by merely changing the material environments of man, and we therefore regret that so much confidence is put in the mere abolition of poverty

and so little attention paid to the cultivation of character by many social reformers.

We tarry yet awhile over the dream of Socialism to point out a few obvious facts and considerations frequently overlooked by the dreamers. One oversight is that implied when the laborer is told that in Socialism he would obtain the entire product of his labor. This is only possible in savagery, & then he would get less than in any other condition. In the present system the capitalist directs labor. It may be a wasteful method, but it is a method and labor must be directed in any system of civilization. In Socialism the state would do the directing. But this would have to be delegated to individuals, and it would require a vast army of managers, clerks etc to carry on the business of the state. These would have to be fed, & fed by labor, and we should hear the same anathemas as now fall on the

capitalists for their "exploitation" of labor.

Besides the fact that these men, who are not commonly rated as "workers" would have to be, we have no guarantee that they would manage the business as well as those now doing it. There is a sort of omniscience and omnipotence attributed to the "State" which is purely fictitious. The state is composed of men & women fallible in their collective as in their individual capacity. We have no assurance whatever that the wisest and most competent would have charge of the management of all the complex system Socialism implies. In fact the best men are seldom put in office now, desirable as it undeniably is that they should be.

Another fact is that distribution would have to be arbitrary and hence at times unjust, otherwise the inequality would not be removed. By distribution

were made equal, there is incentive to special merit would be gone. Even holding out the hope of official promotion would count for but little, for comparatively few could hope to hold the higher offices and if all shared alike the wealth of the state, many would prefer to do nothing at all.

This suggests another fact. The rule of such a social state would have to be despotic. Whatever the form of government its authority would have to be essentially that of a military despotism. When the state assumes the responsibility for every man it must direct him as to how & when & where he shall work. No system of voluntary service could be successful. Men & women crowd the cities now even in the face of starvation. Let every one be assured of a comfortable support & the country would soon all move to the cities where there were an iron authority laid upon every one.

No comparison with the present Civil service can be permitted. Persons employed in this can resign now; but in Socialism there would be nothing for resigners to do. The comparison must be made with the military system and among the privates in the army, where resigning is desertion and deserters are shot. Surely we are not ready to put our necks under the yoke of the most absolute despotism ever known, even in the hope of abolishing poverty.

But that poverty could be abolished as a result of Socialism is an assumption. The world is not rich today. It is growing richer, but the total wealth of the world if divided equally, would leave all poor. Fire, flood, war, pestilence, frost & drought have interfered with the progress toward wealth, and some of these destructive agencies would remain. That men would work any harder or be more prudent under

Socialism does not appear. In other words that the world would grow rich any faster under Socialism is a question which Socialists beg outright.
We have already referred to the difficulty that would be met with in the socialistic economy in getting the most capable men to manage the industrial enterprise of the nation. But this has much to do with the increase of wealth. Now the incapable man fails & the competition of today is a process of natural selection of the fittest men. There would be no way of telling who really had capacity for success save by some method of eliminating the failures. Competition does this. There would of course be rivalry in the social state, but it would be of the nature of political rivalry and it would be more disastrous than now because so immediately connected with industrial conditions. Did it never happen in so holy a cause as the preservation

of our Country that jealousy led to defeat - or the risk of defeat? What warrant have we for supposing that these "Captains of industry" will not oppose each other for official ends?

If Mr. Bellamy had taken a hint from the renowned traveler who delighted our boyhood and devised some surgical means for exchanging brains from the head of one disputant to another, his scheme had been more complete.

There is a factor of civilization but little considered by Socialists, not infrequently disclaimed and repudiated entirely by some of them, viz. the ethical, esthetical and religious life. Those who labor in these fields have no direct reference to "production", but man can "not live by bread alone" and remain man. Who will minister to the higher life of the people? I know that Socialism indulges in rosy pictures of the high moral & religious life in their new order; but all its efforts relate primarily to material things. The state

could not teach religion, and Shaw those who wanted to maintain a Church, a lectureship or an independent press buy up from the State the time of those devoted to these enterprises would be imposing a special tax upon them merely for the sake of relieving the more entirely animal class. It would be a direct tax on progress as such in order that the shiftless might share & share alike with the industrious. In fact it seems to us that Socialism for years to come would be a veritable "going backward" to Chaos & Savagery.

We have referred to the increased number of government officials that would be necessary in Socialism. We had them in mind only the great factories where men work in crowds. But how would it be in the small shops, in the wide field in the lonely forest? Who shall see that these men work well? Must there be a policeman to watch every such man & direct him? We may remark

that there is no broad way to industrial prosperity which contemplates increased police oversight, even though it might seem a paradise to the able bodied drinkmen who would "get on the force."
We would deal fairly with Socialism. It has much in it to commend it to the careful consideration of the Christian. We do not regard it as essentially a beer barrel surmounted by a red flag. It has in it the desire to make the world "look not every man upon his own things but also upon the things of others."
The ideal of true Socialism is near the ideal of Christianity. But the world is not Christianized yet, and we need the law to bring us to Christ - even the law that makes recompence for social neglect a hard & exacting lot.
We have already indicated our conception of the real remedy for the evils of the world.

Chapter III Reforms at Present Possible.

In proposing Christianity as the Remedy for all the evils of social inequality, we do not of course mean any mere ceremonial or ecclesiastical Christianity, but the real Christianity of which Christ is the founder and pattern. The force which Christianity properly so called exerts is what will change envy, injustice and greed into the true altruistic spirit which bears "one another's burdens." But we may be able to indicate some reforms which Christianity as well as sound political economy would require us to adopt as soon as possible.

1 For abolition of the rum traffic we name as of first importance. On the basis of economy and public policy - the only basis legislation can directly act upon - the rum traffic ought to be abolished. It does not pay to have it in existence. Strangely

enough most socialistic writers, while recognizing the evil of intemperance, look upon it as the effect and not the cause of poverty, as we have seen them inclined to do with sin in general. One is at a loss to understand why the almost invariable conjunction of poverty & intemperance should lead these men to conclude that the former causes the latter & not vice-versa. The result is that they invariably propose to abolish intemperance by abolishing the poverty. Mr. Gunton falls into this mistake (Wealth & Progress, p209) merely because he finds most saloons in the poorest districts. The main song of the bird does not cause the sunrise. The direct tax on this nation yearly for alcoholic drinks is $900,000,000. Besides loss of time, health and life: besides the extra police & court expenses entailed. Why are we poor? The rum curse is a sufficient cause alone. Philadelphia paid in 1883, $24,000,000 for rum

and $25.000.000 for strong drink. What good would it do if all rent went to the public while the public was spending more than its rent income for rum?

In America the bill for a year's bread, meat and shoes is given at $505.000.000, $303.000.000 & $196.000.000 respectively. Thus the rum bill is nearly as great as these three combined. There is no doubt that among the intemperate poor the liquor bill is greater than that paid for all necessary Commodities. Turn this gigantic sum into healthful channels and what industry it would cause & what comfort it would bring! It would employ, e.g. 1.000.000 men at a salary of 900 each. As it is the nation would be financially better off if all the men & money in the business were at the bottom of the sea. No, men do not drink because they are poor, but they are poor because they drink. A few may take to drink to drown their misery - but the vast

majority find their misery & their poverty in the cup. By now this evil so evidently and universally a curse can not be uprooted by moral convictions working with and through legislative enactments, it is utterly idle to dream of legislating fraud & injustice and greed out of existence. The saloon is gross, open, palpable & can not be hid. These other qualities that would wreck a social state are often hidden in the hearts of men.

2 Again Christian nations should abolish <u>war</u>. It is a monstrosity, a waste, an unmitigated economic barbarity. It can not be possible to have any high & permanent economic prosperity, or any industrial federation of the world while war looms up as the heritage of every generation. Commerce, Science, industry unite with Christianity in saying that the time has come to abolish war. It is as indefensible as the duel & of

more appalling significance in proportion to the numbers
engaged in it.

3 Prohibit industrial fraud. such as adulteration of food, medicine, etc. This is clearly as important a matter of public policy as it is that bridges shall be safe & buildings properly constructed. Some of the States have legislation on some matters looking to public safety now in the matter of foods, but the general government ought to take hold of the matter. The class legislation that seeks to prohibit the manufacture of artificial compounds, as e.g. oleomargarine is odious. But it one thing to prohibit an unwholesome thing or to require that every thing shall be sold for what it is, & quite another thing to arbitrarily say as Penna. does that patent butter shall not be made at all.

4 Abolish child labor in factories up til 14 years of age & make education compulsory in all the States. State educational oversight & requirement

we are already familiar with. It is a form of socialism that can be extended without danger or without any revolutionary proceedings. In our laws there should be established, in connection with compulsory education, a law depriving every illiterate man of the franchise. We have had quite enough of ignorant voters & voting.

It may seem to some struggling parents that they need the pittance the child is able to earn and that it is an unwarranted interference on the part of society with his right in the child. Such labor, however, as the child undergoes lowers the father's wages. Mr Gunton has shown (Wealth & Progress, p 168) that where the wife & children labor in productive enterprise, the father's wages are lowered by more than the amount the wife & children receive. This arises because of the lower standard of living adopted and because of the competition of a cheaper

grade of labor. This is intimately connected with the "emancipation" of women so often referred to as one of the glories of the Century. If society is to continue the family life, then the competition of women with men in the labor market will prove a disadvantage to the family - to women as well as men. She may do the work as well as the man, but the family will be no richer. It will be found that in those occupations in which the competition between men & women is greatest wages will be lowest.

The old arrangement which made man the wage earner & consigned woman to the care of the home, the spending, if you look at it truly, of what was earned, raised the social standard, & hence the needs of the family. That woman was sometimes abused no one will deny. That she will escape abuse by becoming a wage earner, no one will seriously claim. The old division of duties had a

reason which was not simply the selfishness of the man. (See "The Evolution of Sex", by Prof. Patrick Geddes & J. Arthur Thomson in the Humboldt Library of Science No. 133, pp 247. 248)

If we suppose the "emancipation" of woman in the industrial world to continue until she is free to enter all occupations and is expected to enter some line of professional or industrial life to earn her bread, will the family or the women themselves have been permanent gainers? We doubt it. Solely from an economic standpoint there may be more wealth; but from the higher standpoint of culture, the graces, the social amenities we verily believe the world will be poorer because of this growing competition by women in the world of toil & business. We believe the average wages of female clerks are not as good, all things considered, as

domestics scarce, and yet this is the only service not crowded. Why? Because of the social standing of domestics. And who sets this social standard? The women themselves, and in a very important sense, the women employing the domestics. It would seem that the person who prepares one's food and cares for one's children should have more social consideration than the one who sells muslin or wears it. Will the golden age come when women are in all industries, employing men and women - wielding industrial and political power where she now wields only social power? We shall see.

We record here our conviction that, other things being equal, men are disposed to be more just to women than women are to other women.

We believe that a woman who does the same work as a man should have the same pay: at the same time we

do not believe that wages generally, could be fixed by legislation.

5 We believe that there should be more attention paid to the granting of valuable Charters. A municipality gives away often to street car lines, to water & gas companies rights that should be sold or leased. In some way the City should retain a share of the profits in all enterprises that are in their very nature monopolies.

6. There should be a reform in public and private Charities. It is difficult to say any thing against so ancient and so beautiful a thing as Charity. But almsgiving - the practical expression of the inner grace of Charity, is full of economic peril.

It often is but an opiate to the conscience of the giver, and often tends to pauperize the receiver. An intelligent Christian conscience can not permit any

owe to compound for questionable business transactions or methods by founding a hospital or establishing a soup house. We freely admit that there are times when almsgiving will be necessary. But the indiscriminate giving has no longer a mission. Benvolence must tend more to the prevention of destitution than merely to the relieving of it. That is Charity must help men to help themselves, else it is of questionable utility even from the standpoint of sentiment, while from the standpoint of economy it is only evil. The Associated Charities of various cities and towns do much real work in the way of investigation, advice and by furnishing opportunity for self help.

The most important field for Charity is found in caring for destitute Children. But even here care must be exercised lest unprincipled parents squander their means on vice with the under-

ing that the public will care for the Children any how. The public must care for the Children, but preliminary & any lasting success, such parents as squander their wages on drink & the resulting destitution of the Children, should be locked up and made to work. We are enthusiastic for personal liberty, but society should protect itself, and the time has come to make short work of the "poor inebriate." There has been altogether too much maudlin sentiment over the drunkard. He should be put under such sharp discipline that he would find it to his comfort to keep sober.

It is all very well for the public to play the good Samaritan a few times, but the "public" which does not dislodge the robbers infesting the path between the Jerusalem & Jerich of Childhood & adult life, is remiss in one of its most important duties.

The spasmodic charity conducted by some newspapers & churches which sends a

few hundred Children to the country each summer means well. But it by no means covers the case. It should take a more permanent and ambitious form, and it were better not to call it Charity at all, but justice, public policy and good sense. The miserable tenements in which the poor children languish should be torn down - the alleys broadened, and breathing places made in the crowded parts of the cities. It will soon pay financially in the long run, and if it should not thus pay, we would at least come nearer God's idea of what we should do. The worship of Molock was not more cruel than some of the things our easy-going let-alone-policy of a civilization permits. That slaughter of innocents known as Baby Farming has unspeakable horrors connected with it. The Thenardier's inhuman treatment of little Cosette becomes almost angelic in comparison with the woes inflicted

on babes in some of these baby farming establishments. If we must kill the babes then let us do it in some humane manner. (See article by Rev. Benjamin Waugh in Contemporary Review for May 1890)

But there are adults who are living on the verge of pauperdom and who are constantly drifting into it because they cannot look out for themselves. They may be fairly good workmen but they have not the capacity to find work. What shall we do with them? Look out for them of course. Find them work and pay them a moderate sum for their work. It were infinitely better to do this before they become paupers or criminals. A few years ago a man in Pittsburgh, Pa. cold, hungry and discouraged, applied to the authorities to be sent to the work house where he might earn his living till spring. He was refused and went out and hurled

a stone through a store window. He was arrested and sent up for three months.

Is it wise to insist that a man shall become a criminal or vagabond before he can be taken care of? Charitable institutions run a few woodsaws and laundries but what are these among so many? Will it not be possible to establish public works that are not penal or reformatory, and that do not have the poor farm associations against which Americans have a wholesome prejudice? Such enterprises would give fair pay for fair work and ought to be self-supporting. Wages ought to be a trifle lower than in similar industries carried on by private capital so as not to encourage any dependence upon such public institutions. The evident objection is that it will be difficult to keep such establishments out of the hands of political jobbery & corruption. But if we do

not find some way out of political corruption into cleaner & better municipal government our cities are doomed. No people can be established upon fraud. The power religion is taken into politics, and the utmost morality and honesty established in all public places, & all pot house politicians banished, The better. We have got to be governed decently or Chaos awaits us.

I am aware that Mr. Shaw, one of the Fabian Essayists in Socialism, (Fabian Essays p.192) gives municipal employment as one of the modes of transition to Socialism. But there is a Christian socialism which we need not fear, and if municipal employment tends toward it, we nevertheless favor this as much the wisest form public Charity can at present take.

7 We believe to that the time Shaw says when the government should

own and controll the telegraph lines & Railroads.
Mr. Wanamaker, the Post Master General,
has advised Postal telegraphy. He is a keen
practical business man, and the advantages
of a complete Government monopoly in
the transmission of mess are obvious.
The Postal Service makes large use of Rail
way lines, and we believe the Government
should buy them all up, not at fictitious
"watered" prices, but at the actual cost
it would involve to produce them today.
The railroad facilities in this country
are certainly good, and in the main
Cheap. But the public has a vital interest
in railroads, and both managers and em-
ployes at times prolong strikes to the detri-
ment of the public. Besides it is possible
to have things too Cheap to be just to those
employed. That rail roads could be run
under our general management
more advantageously than where a div-

ostrous competition obtains must be evident. The speculation in railroad securities, now often a gambling lodge, would cease under government ownership.

We do not favor government control of railroads as a tub to the Socialist whale but because the public interests would be better served.

But we turn once more to remark that no mere external devices can cure the ills of the world. The only remedy lies in saving man from indolence, intemperance, extravagance, greed and all the forms of injustice which selfishness inflicts. And we believe that the only way to save man is truly to Christianize him. The world today needs not Socialism, nor yet its opposite - anarchistic Individualism, but it needs the qualities for which the Christian religion stands. When we rise above ecclesiasticism and come

to some large and true conception of what Christ is to and for this world, as well as the next; when we ack today with wise reference to all tomorrows, the problem of Social Inequality will be solved. Not that all men will be socially equal or have equal wealth; but the inequalities that remain will be tempered by justice and mercy, and will themselves represent vital and essential distinctions in character. If Christianity, with the sublime example of its Founder, with its heritage of Chivalry and faith, with its high hopes and tender consolations, with its solemn and authoritative calls to duty, justice, benevolence and humanity can do nothing for this world, then an appeal to the universal stomache of mankind can not bring salvation; and we may as well await the coming of Chaos and Night with philosophical resignation to fate. But Christianity Can do something for this world, and this is no time for the Church to cry "To your

texts O Israel", but to cry forward,
every man girded and inspired for
the conquest of the world, making no
halt or truce until the "kingdoms of this
world shall have become the king-
dom of our Lord & of his Christ."
And then safety, plenty, and peace
will be the inheritance of the nations,
and the dream of the ages will become
the experience of a redeemed world.

N. Cameron.

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
1 1719 02575 7131